Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/947,221	CHAKRABARTI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LE, Uyen	2171
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>John L. Rogitz</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Safet Metjahic</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 8 September 2004	Time: <u>10:30AM e.s.t.</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	icant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  N/A		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:  N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summation.</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance
•		
	•	
11+1		
aft him		
SAFET RIETUANIC		
PERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY COUTLE 2100		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Metjahic obtained permission from Mr. Rogitz to amend Claim 12 by adding "computerized" to the first line of the preamble of Claim 12 - between "A" and "method." Examiner Metjahic requested authorization for the Examiner's amendment in order to avoid any 35 USC 101 issues - namely, that the claim may be construed as not directed toward statutory subject matter. The amendment would clearly place the claimed subject matter in the technological arts, having a useful, tangible and concrete result.